

THE LIBERATOR.

No Union with Slaveholders.

BOSTON, JUNE 9, 1854.

NEW ENGLAND
ANTI-SLAVERY CONVENTION.

The New England Anti-Slavery Convention assembled at the Melodeon, in Boston, Tuesday morning, May 30th, and was called to order by Francis Jackson, Chairman of the Committee of Arrangements.

On motion, it was *Resolved*, That a Committee be nominated by the Chair, to report officers for the Convention. SAMUEL MAY, JR., of Boston, CHARLES S. S. GRIFFING, of Ohio, and ELIAS SMITH, of New York, were nominated and chosen said Committee.

Prayer was offered by Rev. S. S. GRISWOLD, of Connecticut.

Voted, unanimously, on motion of Samuel May, Jr., that all persons present, whether from the New England States or elsewhere, friendly to the anti-slavery cause, be invited to become members of the Convention.

The Committee of Nomination reported a list of persons for officers of the Convention, which, with some additions subsequently made and accepted by the Convention, is as follows:—

For President,
EDMUND QUINCY.

Vice Presidents—FRANCIS JACKSON, Boston; ANDREW ROBERTSON, New Bedford; CHARLES L. REMOND, Salem; EPHRAIM L. CAPRON, Worcester; WILLIAM WHITTING, Concord; SAMUEL J. MAY, Syracuse, N. Y.; S. S. GRISWOLD, Mystic, Ct.; ANDREW T. FOSB, Manchester, N. H.; WILLIAM GREEN, Hartford, Ct.; THOMAS ASHLEY, Delaware; JACOB WALTON, Jr., Michigan; DANIEL MITCHELL, Rhode Island; JEREMIAH CLAYTON, Vermont; LUCAS CRANDALL, New Jersey.

Secretaries—SAMUEL MAY, JR., Boston; ELIAS SMITH, New York City.

Committee of Finance—Elbridge Sprague, Abington; Josephine S. Griffing, Salem, Ohio; Reuben H. Ober, Boston; Eli Belknap, Hopkinton.

Business Committee—Wm. Lloyd Garrison, Wendell Phillips, Stephen S. Foster, Abby Kelley Foster, Lucy Stone, Andrew T. Foss, Charles S. S. Griffing, Henry C. Wright, Samuel J. May, Sydney Howard Gay, Elizabeth Wright.

The report was accepted, and the individuals named elected.

HENRY C. WRIGHT offered, for the consideration of the meeting, the following resolutions:—

Resolved, That resistance to slave-hunters and slave-catchers is obedience to God; and, in whatever forms they may appear among us, whether as President, Marshal, or Commissioner of the United States, or as officers of the State government, or as Southern slaveholders or their minions, we pledge ourselves to resist them, each one by such means as he shall deem right and expedient.

Resolved, That no man should be allowed to be put on trial before any court in this State, or in the nation, on the issue whether he is a *freeman* or a *slave*—a *brute* or a *man*; and that no court should be allowed to hold a session in this State to try a case involving such an issue.

Resolved, That the government of the State of Massachusetts having, in many ways, demonstrated its unwillingness and incompetency to protect its citizens against kidnappers, it is the right and duty of each man and woman to protect themselves against such assaults upon their dearest personal rights, by such weapons as the conscience and judgment of each shall allow them to use.

Resolved, That the citizens of the free States are bound to resist the execution of the Fugitive Slave Law, and to call every man to account before the tribunal of the people, who shall attempt to execute it.

ANDREW T. FOSB, of New Hampshire, addressed the Convention with much feeling and eloquence upon the resolutions, and especially upon the state of things now existing in the city of Boston;—a Virginia slaveholder being here, claiming Anthony Burns as his slave, and being supported in this infamous claim by a mock trial going on before EDWARD G. LORING; and the whole city and State being aroused and exceedingly excited by the fact, and awaiting, with intense and painful interest, the Commissioner's decision. Mr. F. referred to the indignities and insults heaped upon many of our citizens, and particularly referred to the incarceration in the watch-house, for several hours, of an excellent and respectable lady (Miss Caroline Hinckley) for standing, contrary to orders, upon the steps of the Court House. As she sang aloud some liberty-songs in the prison, her jailers were led to release her.

Mr. BLACKWELL, of Cincinnati, supported the resolutions in a very earnest and indignant speech. He characterized the slave-hunters' doings in Boston with great severity, and, though not technically a disunionist, expressed his conviction that the dissolution of this bloody and despotic Union must come, and his entire readiness that it should come. Mr. Blackwell, by way of contrast to the proceedings in this city before Commissioner Loring, referred to the treatment which the appointed agent of Massachusetts, the Hon. Samuel Hoar, received some years since in Charleston, S. C., because he went simply to test, before the United States Courts there, the lawfulness of selling free-born Massachusetts citizens into slavery for life.

SAMUEL MAY, JR., after saying that the place of our present meeting did not seem to him to be the place for us, when the United States Commissioner might, at this very moment, be giving his decision to send Anthony Burns into Southern slavery, and that the more suitable place seemed to be around that Court-House, now turned into a slave-pen, moved that the Convention do now adjourn, to reassemble in the afternoon, if circumstances should favor. But upon objection, from S. S. Foster and others, the motion was negatived.

STEPHEN S. FOSTER, of Worcester, introduced the following resolutions:—

Resolved, That the experience of the last few days proves the necessity of a more thorough and efficient organization of the friends of freedom throughout this Commonwealth, and the New England States, for the special purpose of protecting our own citizens against the powerful band of kidnappers by whom the country is infested, and whose presence among us is imminently dangerous to the liberty and life of every honest, upright man.

Resolved, That a Committee of five be appointed by the Chair, to meet a similar Committee that may be appointed by the Free Soil Convention now in session, to mature a plan for such organization, and report at a subsequent session of this Convention.

Mr. F., in a speech, advocated the necessity of a thorough organization to protect New England citizens from being kidnapped.

J. J. KELLY, of Boston, (a colored man, and introduced as the man who bore the banner of the Worcester Freedom Club,) addressed the Convention. If, said Mr. Foster is a non-resistance, I am not. If the kidnappers should seize my infant, I would not my prayers in righteousness—to hasten to strike the blow for my child, and freedom.

H. C. WRIGHT rose to second the resolutions of Mr. Foster,—to form a thorough organization in the New England States, to protect the citizens against kidnapping. He believed the present case of slave-catching was preconcerted at Washington, by the President and his advisers, to test the sincerity of the declaration put forth against the Nebraska Bill, and the further enforcement of the Compromises of 1850. The authority delegated to the different commanders of troops at neighboring military posts, to hold themselves at the

service of the slave-catchers here, proves this. They mean to establish the right to bring their slaves into and keep them in the free States. Who is ready to die in defence of liberty—for principles—that is the question. State street would establish slavery in Boston to-day, if it could make money by it. How many would die for slavery? He believed every Catholic Irishman in this country would do it. [An individual in the audience interrupted the speaker by saying that he was an Irishman and a Catholic, and he would not do it! but, upon being questioned, admitted that he had voted for Mr. Pierce as President, and added further, that he would do so again. This remark exposed fully his pro-slavery position.]

FRANCIS JACKSON spoke of his attempt to get access to the Court-House, and of his repulse; he had told the officers that he had lived and paid taxes forty years in Boston. Mr. MAY also related his attempt to enter, and repulse; having been with others driven through the building at the point of the bayonet, notwithstanding he exhibited a pass from the U. S. Marshal. Some one said that a *Virginian* was admitted upon stating that he was such; Mr. WRIGHT resumed, and declared that Massachusetts was insulted and trodden in the dust; he alluded to the treatment of Mrs. Douglas and Miss Webster.

Mr. JOHN ORVIS, of Boston, related a recent conversation held by one of Col. Suttle's slave-catching companions in this city, with an acquaintance of his, who having for some years resided in Texas, had acquired a southern air and manner, and was doubtless mistaken for a Southern man. This *Virginian* had told him that the State of Virginia, by its Governor, had engaged to pay all the expenses of Capt. Suttle (the slave-catcher) in this case; and that this was a deliberate plan to override the State and Municipal laws of Massachusetts, and to humble her in the very dust at the feet of Virginia and Slavery.

Adjusted.

AFTERNOON. Re-assembled at 3 P. M. FRANCIS JACKSON in the chair.

Rev. S. S. GRISWOLD, of Connecticut, said that he came to plead the cause of man as man, not as black man or white man, but upon the broad principle of humanity. He urged those who believed in physical resistance to arm themselves and resist the enslavement of the man Burns; but that he could not do so; he could not oppose evil by any other than moral means. He had seen persons about Court Square with pistols in their pockets. No victory could be gained by such instrumentalities. The greatest victory that was ever achieved was by Jesus Christ, by the power of love and good will, and he had no doubt of the final triumph of this principle. The world had lost its faith in Christian principles, it considered Christianity a failure, but we had no true representation of the system among us. We must not judge by what we see of the religion which Jesus loved and taught. (By one of the audience—'Will Christianity rescue Burns?') Ans. I cannot say that it will;—it could not rescue Jesus, and it could not have power to deliver me, or you, from temporal evil and death; but as I do not believe that a man is dead because his head is cut off, it follows that to be 'rescued' or delivered from our enemies is not always the most essential thing. There is an old book which says, 'tho' being dead, he yet speaketh.' Many men speak louder after they are dead than when living. But, asked the speaker, will Col. Suttle's revolvers serve you? Have not many of the most mighty warriors been made to bite the dust? He urged the adherence to peaceful principles until the evil nature of man shall be entirely renovated, and sin be swept from the earth.

JOHN PRINCE, of Essex, supported Mr. Foster's resolutions in favor of a thorough organization to protect the fugitive. He would have that organization extensive, and secret.

The Finance Committee here proceeded, by vote of the Convention, to make the usual collections for the expenses of the Convention.

W. L. GARRISON expressed his doubts as to where we ought to be at this hour;—he was sure our spirits were around that Bastille in Court Square where Anthony Burns lies incarcerated, and waiting the sentence to send him into slavery; and he knew not but our bodies should be there too. The last speaker had expressed his surprise at finding that all Boston had *cared* in it; See, said Mr. G., what comes of the spirit of violent resistance; those who have talked the loudest, have been among the last. If he bore no arms, it was not because he was false to his principles, but because he was true to them. There were those who had talked loudly of bearing arms, but where was their fidelity to their principles? He commented also on Mr. Prince's idea of secret organization—he must entirely object to that principle;—when we save a man, it should be 'before all Israel and the sun.' Secrecy and stealth are the methods of Slavery and Iniquity.

Mrs. THOMPSON (colored) with much effect defended the peace method of resisting the slave-power, as the only effectual method of overcoming it. She referred to Mr. Garrison's labours in the cause feelingly and gratefully.

Mr. PRINCE, of Essex, explained, and again advocated the organization of secret clubs in every town in the State.

STEPHEN S. FOSTER further explained his own position in regard to the use of warlike weapons. Every man, he said, should fight against slavery with his own weapons,—with those whose use he best understood, and in which he most trusted. If those were physical weapons, let him use them. He said that men in the country, (and he spoke especially of Worcester,) were ready to combine and organize against kidnapping, if those in the city were not; and they were men who might be depended upon, in any extremity.

Mr. REMOND, of Salem, here rose to complain of the too frequent contrast of Boston and Worcester—city and country. So far as he knew, the abolitionists of Boston had been as ready to adopt every possible and practicable measure, as those in Worcester or elsewhere. Mr. R. referred to the fact that the banner of the Worcester Freedom Club had been taken from one of the Boston Police; and said that on its being restored to them, was triumphantly held.

Mr. FOSTER explained that he did not mean to contrast the places unfavorably;—he spoke of Worcester, because it was his residence, and he knew whereof he affirmed. They had always protected their fugitive brethren. He wished a thorough organization, whose head should be in the city, and its body in the country.

Rev. SAMUEL J. MAY, of Syracuse, said he was too much depressed, by the state of things existing at this moment in this city, and generally through the North, to speak as he would like to do. Still, he had no feeling akin to despair. Indeed, he saw very many reasons for encouragement, North and South. At the South there is an increasing body of non-slaveholders, looking with more and more disfavor upon slavery; while at the North a party is arising steadily and surely, which will ere long combine with the early and radical friends of freedom to throw off the yoke of slavery. Mr. M. alluded to the fact that the beginning of the present anti-slavery movement was in the South, and with slaveholders. As long ago as 1817, the friends of the colonization scheme came to the North, and represented to the Northern people the deplorable condition of the slave population, and the increasing demoralization of the white population, and with all real and eloquence begged the North to aid in mitigating and removing these fearful evils, and held out the colonization scheme as a ready means to that end. The North responded; we were long deceived by that Society; but we saw at length (whatever the motives of its originators) that the Society became a mere tool in the hands of the slaveholders, a convenient medium for conveying away restless and dangerous slaves, and a safety-valve by which the consciences of individual repentant slaveholders could be relieved, without infecting the general mass.

Some very eloquent remarks next followed from LUCY STONE and CHARLES L. REMOND, which we do not attempt to sketch, as they will be published in full from a photographic report by Mr. Jas. M. W. Yerrinton.

Wm. L. GARRISON, after a few remarks touching the disgraceful fact of a man seized in Boston streets as a slave, and demanded to be given up into slavery, and with reference to the Free Democratic Convention to meet on the morrow, proposed that this Convention omit its session to-morrow. He made a motion to that effect.

SAMUEL MAY, Jr., saying that the leading features of the Convention to-morrow at the Music Hall would doubtless be anti-Nebraska Bill and anti-Fugitive Slave Law, declined the motion.

ABBY KELLEY FOSTER asked if the Free Soil Convention would be a meeting for free speech. [No! from some in the audience.]

Mr. GARRISON could not answer that. He supposed the speakers would be somewhat select, having been invited either from Washington or elsewhere, such as Messrs. Giddings, Hale, &c.

Mrs. FOSTER, STEPHEN S. FOSTER, and Wm. R. EARL opposed the motion to adjourn.

Mr. GARRISON saying he had no wish to omit on meeting, save with general consent, withdrew his motion.

A vote was then taken, and carried, to adjourn to to-morrow morning, at 10 o'clock.

In short, that it was, as an anti-slavery measure, a great deal worse than nothing. Mr. May said he was known to be a lover of peace; but his spirit was stirred by such scenes, as those we were now hourly looking upon, and while he counselled a violent rescue, rather than submission to kidnapping, yet he would have men act not in the spirit of *fighters*, but of *martyrs*; in the same spirit which led brave men, at the risk of their lives, to rush into a burning building, to rescue a brother in danger,—not to kill or harm those who sought to enslave him. He wished also to remind citizens of Boston, who were now declining against resistance to the atrocious Fugitive Slave Law, that they themselves, not many years since, led on by their wealthier and most influential merchants, denounced the government measures, requiring letter postage to be paid in specie, and declared that 'the government must be resisted, peacefully if we can, forcibly if we must.'

SARAH PELLET, of Syracuse, said the people of Syracuse, a few days since, were informed that a fugitive slave was about to be taken through their town on the Railroad; and they assembled, three thousand strong, to rescue him. It was a false alarm,—perhaps a designed hoax. For her part, she believed in forcibly rescuing a kidnapped slave; not only in removing the rails, but in using powder and ball to put down the slave-catchers. She could stand over the fire, as her mother did, and run up lead into bullets. She appealed to the men and women of Boston to rise and redeem themselves from the stain which now rested on them, and show themselves worthy descendants of those true Spartan mothers,—the women of the Revolution. She said that the city council of Syracuse had voted that if the Central Rail Road (running through that city) should carry fugitive slaves on their way back to slavery, the rails should be taken up from their tracks.

Rev. Mr. HASSALL, of Mendon, said that two years ago he had risen to speak in this place, and had then prefaced his remarks by declaring himself no Garrisonian, though an abolitionist. Ever since that, said he, I have been getting nearer and nearer to the 'Garrisonians.'

And since he came to this city, on Friday last, what he had seen had determined him to adopt for his motto, henceforth and forever, 'No Union with Slaveholders!' He was glad to stand in unity with the Society here represented, for he regarded it as the quintessence of anti-slavery. He referred to the Unitarian meetings which he had attended that day,—the prayer-meeting in the morning, and the festival in the afternoon. While every other topic in the scope of religious discussion was treated, there had not been so much as an allusion to the poor slave now imprisoned in the Boston Court-House, and soon (it was to be feared) to be sent back into life-long slavery.

Rev. Mr. PIERPONT, of Needford, desired to say that, in the blessing asked at the commencement of the collation, he thought he did perceive a reference to the slave case. (!)

Mr. MAY, of Syracuse, also said that, in the Report presented in the forenoon at the annual meeting of the American Unitarian Association, a distinct recommendation had been presented to recognize and aid the anti-slavery movement; and, moreover, on the motion of a Southern man to strike said recommendation out of the report, that the Association had refused to strike out.

Mr. FOWLER, of Cambridge, (a student in the Theological School,) in a speech of considerable length, said he had had an experience in the Unitarian denomination, on this subject, which at times had greatly perplexed and alienated him; and then, at other times, had encouraged him. It is true, as his friend Hassall had said, that no allusion was made, during the long Unitarian collation, to the slave case, till near the close; when he himself had made an earnest appeal to his brethren and friends present, who received his words with the warmest applause.

Rev. Mr. HASSALL said this had transpired after he left the Collation-hall.

[Vote.—We thought it strange that it was left to a young student in divinity to do, at the close, what the elders and doctors of the law ought to have done at the beginning.]—Secretaries.

Rev. Mr. FOSB rose to inform the audience that Mr. Fowler had been arrested, only the evening previous, and put in the lock-up, only for speaking aloud, in Boston streets, his love of liberty and his hatred of slavery.

Adjusted.

EVENING. EDMUND QUINCY, President of the Convention, in the chair.

Rev. Mr. CRANDALL, of New Jersey, offered the following resolution:—

Resolved, That the Government of the United States has so signally and habitually failed to maintain and secure the rights of its citizens, that it can no longer be depended upon for that exalted service; and that we are therefore forced to seek the peaceable dissolution of this Government, and the organization of a new Republic on the principle of universal and equal liberty and rights.

Mr. C. said he considered dividing an evil in itself, into a good thing in itself; but he did not believe in the possibility of a true union, a real union between freedom and slavery. It was with pain that he had come to the conclusion that the dissolution of the American Union was an end to be sought for by all lovers of freedom, and right, and humanity; but he had fully come to that conclusion. It is our duty to form a new political organization—no purely for freedom, and the equal rights of all. He opposed secret organizations, regarding them as hostile to civil, social, and religious liberty. In all these things, he said, he found himself agreeing quite closely with Mr. Garrison,—more so with him than with any other speaker who had yet appeared on this platform;—notwithstanding Mr. G. had been so often represented to him as anything but a good man. Mr. Crandall warmly eulogized the spirit which Mr. Garrison manifested. It is the duty of all, he thought, to aim at a thorough regeneration, social and individual, reaching to the very foundations of society.

ELIZABETH WRIGHT, of Pennsylvania, expressed herself as coinciding with the spirit of Mr. Crandall's resolution, but she thought that, few as we are, we could not dissolve our union with the slaveholding government of this country. Go where we may, we everywhere encounter the slaveholding and slave-driving spirit. She compared the existing spirit in this community and country with what it was in the time of Patrick Henry, who said, 'Give me liberty, or give me death.'

Some very eloquent remarks next followed from LUCY STONE and CHARLES L. REMOND, which we do not attempt to sketch, as they will be published in full from a photographic report by Mr. Jas. M. W. Yerrinton.

Wm. L. GARRISON, after a few remarks touching the disgraceful fact of a man seized in Boston streets as a slave, and demanded to be given up into slavery, and with reference to the Free Democratic Convention to meet on the morrow, proposed that this Convention omit its session to-morrow. He made a motion to that effect.

SAMUEL MAY, Jr., saying that the leading features of the Convention to-morrow at the Music Hall would doubtless be anti-Nebraska Bill and anti-Fugitive Slave Law, declined the motion.

ABBY KELLEY FOSTER asked if the Free Soil Convention would be a meeting for free speech. [No! from some in the audience.]

Mr. GARRISON could not answer that. He supposed the speakers would be somewhat select, having been invited either from Washington or elsewhere, such as Messrs. Giddings, Hale, &c.

Mrs. FOSTER, STEPHEN S. FOSTER, and Wm. R. EARL opposed the motion to adjourn.

Mr. GARRISON saying he had no wish to omit on meeting, save with general consent, withdrew his motion.

A vote was then taken, and carried, to adjourn to to-morrow morning, at 10 o'clock.

WEDNESDAY.
Convention re-assembled at the Melodeon. FRANCIS JACKSON called to order at 10 o'clock.

Addresses were made by Rev. Mr. Hutchins, of Charleston, and Messrs. Stacy of Milford, Remond of Salem, and May of Boston.

Mr. PIERCE, of Essex, further advocated his idea of a secret organization; not that the fact of such an organization, or those who composed it, should be kept secret, but their *modus operandi*. The Underground Railroad Company was a secret organization, and did their work very effectually. Tact is necessary, as well as principle, in forwarding every good work. Faneuil Hall meeting had recommended that the streets should be blocked with people, and the carrying off of Burns rendered impracticable. But this did not follow. Such men as compose the United States troops would not hesitate to clear such a crowd with the bayonet and cannon. We must meet tyranny with an open resistance.

The resolutions offered by S. S. Foster respecting the Free Soil Convention, and a Committee of Conference therewith, were further debated by Messrs. Griswold of Conn., H. C. Wright, S. S. Foster, and C. S. S. Griffing of Ohio, and were unanimously adopted.

Mrs. FOSTER addressed the women, exhorting them to work for the anti-slavery cause, and stand beside their husbands, fathers and brothers at the present crisis.

G. W. F. MELLETT spoke on the general subject.

Adjusted.

AFTERNOON. Edmund Quincy in the chair.

Mrs. FOSTER spoke on the past and present position of the Free Soil party.

Rev. S. S. GRISWOLD offered the following resolution:—

Resolved, That anti-slavery is based upon those eternal principles of equity which rest upon the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man, and can never cease to agitate until these great truths are universally recognized.

Resolved, That although the dissolution of the Union should take place, such dissolution would not absolve us from laboring in the anti-slavery cause.

Col. WHITTING, of Concord, being in the chair.

These resolutions were discussed by Mr. Griswold, Rev. J. Claflin of Vermont, Mrs. Thompson, and Elizabeth Wright.

STEPHEN S. FOSTER offered the following resolution:—

Resolved, That the Free Soil party, by supporting a Constitution and Union which, according to its own interpretation, allow of the enslavement of one sixth of our population, and by electing to office many of the vilest pro-slavery men and dogfaces of the country, has proved itself devoid of principle, false to the cause of Liberty, and utterly unworthy of the confidence and support of those who would labor effectually for the abolition of slavery.

After some discussion of the same, the Convention adjourned.

EVENING. Francis Jackson in the chair.

HERBERT GLEASON, of Malden, expressed the hope that we should have short speeches, unless the speakers were endowed with peculiar power to edify.

EDMUND QUINCY addressed the Convention. He said he was no orator, as Phillips is, and as Garrison is; he was a plain, blunt man; he only spoke right on, and told them that which they themselves did know. But he thanked God that he had given the best years of his life to the anti-slavery cause. (Cheers.) He knew not that he had done the slave any good, or if he had been able to help forward the day of his deliverance; but he did know that he had greatly benefited himself. And what a work, said Mr. Q., has this anti-slavery agitation accomplished! The whole land rocking with agitation, brought about by just such meetings as we are now holding. These meetings are the laboratories where revolutions are commenced. Jesus uttered a philosophical truth when he said to his disciples, 'The kingdom of God is within you.' It is the in-dwelling idea, will, sentiment, which make the man, and which, in the bosoms of true men, work out the widest and deepest changes in human society. Why have we slavery in this country? It is because the people love to have it, and they love it, not for itself and its hideous features, but for what it gives them. In their minds, Slavery stands for money, for gain, for property; it stands for clipper-ships, for houses in Beacon street and the Fifth Avenue, for tours abroad, for works of art and magnificent equipages, for dinners of ten courses and twenty-five kinds of wine, &c., &c. &c. Hence came the revolution which brought Charles the First to the block! Did it commence in 1642? No; but far back in the days of early Puritanism. The men who began it were the parish ministers who left their benefices and livings for conscience sake, and taught the people their rights and their duties. Did the American Revolution begin in 1776 at Lexington and Bunker Hill? Surely not. But through the long years, when the exactions and tyrannies of the Home government were discussed at firesides and from pulpits, the popular mind was educating, and the generation was training to be prepared to accomplish that great work.—And we are preparing the way for a new and greater revolution,—we are pioneering the way for those who are coming to perfect it. We are educating the public mind for it, and the public conscience is ripening under the faithful lessons and rebukes it receives at the hands of the uncompromising abolitionists. Let us not then have any fear for our work, or for the manner of doing it. In faith, and with assured vision, we are sowing around us and through the land the seeds of overthrowing truth. God will watch and care for it, and give it an abundant and a glorious harvest.

Rev. SAMUEL J. MAY, of Syracuse, addressed the meeting. He spoke of the very great difference, in many respects, between Syracuse and Boston, and the consequent difficulty of making a comparison between them. He proceeded to explain the tone of censure and severity, which some might think he had used, in his yesterday's remarks.

At this point, WENDELL PHILLIPS was recognized entering the house,—for the first time during the Sessions of the Convention. Mr. Phillips's resolute and fearless course since the commencement of the fugitive slave case now pending in the city, excited anew the admiration of thousands, and had won for him a larger place in the hearts of the friends of freedom. Soon as he was recognized, murmurs of applause began, which soon swelled into tumultuous cheering. As he came to the platform, three cheers were called for Wendell Phillips, and given with an unequalled enthusiasm. Some unrepentant in the rear called for three groans for Theodore Parker. Mr. Parker has been equally devoted to Mr. Phillips to the slave's welfare and the city's true honor, from the first hour of this kidnapping outrage. One feels groan from two or three persons arose, and died away, unable to reach a second. Instantly followed the call, *Three cheers for Theodore Parker*, and another tremendous outburst of feeling came from the audience, telling of the wide place which Mr. Parker had in the regard and confidence of the Convention.

WENDELL PHILLIPS (being vehemently called for) came forward and addressed the Convention in a speech of very great power. [It will appear at length, from the photographic report.]

Then followed loud calls for Theodore Parker, but he was not in the house.

Gen. HENRY WILSON being recognized in the audience, was loudly called for, came forward, and made an animated speech; (which also will be fully reported.)

HENRY C. WRIGHT asked Gen. Wilson to tell us how we are to 'change the hearts and consciences of the people.'

Mr. Wilson replied, 'By inculcating sound constitutional views, and voting for true anti-slavery men.'

Mr. WRIGHT asked how men were to be brought to vote thus; and went on to urge the Free Soil party to

send at able and faithful anti-slavery lecturers—such as Joshua R. Giddings,—to revolutionize the public sentiment of Massachusetts.

Mr. ABBY KELLEY FOSTER wished to ask Gen. Wilson on one question. What security has any one, said Mrs. F., in giving his vote to the Free Soil party, that we shall not be helping the worst pro-slavery men into office? Heretofore we have seen the Free Soil party coalescing with the Democratic party, electing George S. Boutwell, a timid dogface, to the Governor's chair, and helping to place *Calich Cushing*, (?) the vilest pro-slavery man anywhere to be found, on the Supreme Judicial Bench of the State. Who can assure us that we shall not, by and by, see them putting that wretched tool of slavery, Benjamin F. Hall, into office? Mrs. F. said she asked these questions in good faith, and not from any wish to cavil.

Mr. COBURN made a few remarks, favorable to the Free Soil party.

Adjusted.

THURSDAY.

The Convention again assembled at the Melodeon, and was called to order, soon after 10 o'clock, by Francis Jackson.

Rev. Mr. CRANDALL, of New Jersey, spoke well on the irresistible power of the principle of good-will to all men. He acknowledged that the professed ministers of religion in the land had been criminally neglectful of their duty to the anti-slavery cause; but, he said, the people had been guilty too. He said it was the people's duty to go ahead of the ministers, when they kept back, and to become, themselves, true ministers of Christ and freedom.

N. H. WHITTING, of Marshfield, made a clear and very impressive statement of the corrupting effects of our union with slaveholders upon Northern conscience and feeling. He showed the long and toilsome labor yet before the true abolitionists.

SAMUEL MAY, JR., in a few remarks, introduced the subject of pecuniary contributions, and moved that the Committee of Finance now proceed to receive donations and pledges of money to the anti-slavery treasury.

Seconded, and unanimously adopted.

S. S. FOSTER, of Worcester, spoke of the necessity of contributing freely to this cause.

LUCY STONE followed on the same subject.

The brothers Hutchinson were introduced, and beautifully sang together a song—"Let the bondman go free."

Adjusted.

AFTERNOON. Edmund Quincy in the chair.

Mrs. CATHERINE S. BROWN spoke on the sufferings of woman, and her right and her duty to advocate this cause.

On motion of S. May, Jr., six persons were added to the Vice Presidents of the Convention. Their names, having been printed on the list above, need not be repeated here.

THOMAS GARRETT, of Delaware, (one of those whose names were thus added,) and who is extensively known as a fast friend of the slave, and one who has aided near two thousand slaves in obtaining their liberty, was loudly called for, was introduced to the audience, came forward, was received with the warmest cheers, and made a brief statement of the case of some recent fugitives.

POETRY.

THE ECLIPSE.

Thou dost well to hide thy face, oh Sun,
And darkly veil thy shame-suffused brow;
For never since creation was begun,
Hast thou such cause to blush for earth as now.
It matters not which side thou look'st upon,
There is no zone where Liberty is safe,
No hemisphere where justice may be done:
No land, no continent doth Ocean chafe.
That Morning doth not in the chains of Wrong,
Which day doth rivet—Night make doubly strong:
The lands most blest by thee hath Slavery curst,
Withhold thy beams! I little reck how long.
For Right is vanquish'd, Hell its bounds hath burst,
And Satan seeks the light, and glories in the worst.
Salem, May 26, 1854.

THE TWO BRIDGES.

Very lately I saw, in a wonderful dream,
Two bridges thrown over a rapid stream:
In the channel between each rocky shore,
The waters rushed down with a hideous roar.
These bridges were called, by the voice of the nation,
Textual, the first, and the last, Moderation;
And both, in my dream, were examined with care,
For of diverse materials and structure they were;
While I narrowly marked the vast crowds as they passed,
Over both of these bridges, the first and the last.

The former was built of stone, in huge blocks,
And had for foundation immovable rocks;
The road was fine gravel, the pathway was wide,
And a parapet wall was raised up on each side.
No toll-gate was there, for the passage was free,
No work for 'Rebels' at all could I see,
And safely the passengers passed in high glee.
I heard them all sing, as they passed the wide river,
'Textual's the bridge—Textual forever!'

But words cannot utter the doleful relation,
Of all that I saw of the bridge Moderation,
Of all that I heard in my marvellous dream,
And of thousands who perished while crossing the stream.

This bridge, though by many declared to be good—
Nay, the best—was constructed entirely of wood;
For, on piles standing upright, the pathway was made,
With planks long and smooth horizontally laid:
But I saw with surprise, though the stream was so wide,
There was no pilings raised up on each side,
To prevent any passenger, passing that way,
From plunging down headlong, grim death's certain prey.

And much did I wonder to mark in my dream,
That the path crossing over this terrible stream,
Only right in the middle was perfectly level;
For the planks on each side downward sloped on a level;
And the nearer they verged to the farthest shore,
Their outermost edges shelled downward the more.

Now, strange to relate, though this dangerous bridge
Had nowhere an inch of parapet ridge,
And the sides were so shelving and slippery too,
Yet multitudes daily this path would pursue,
Notwithstanding they paid a tremendous high toll,
And risked the destruction of body and soul.

It is true, you might cross by the bridge Moderation,
This roaring, wide river, without perturbation,
And only have daily a trifle to pay,
If you kept to the middle and narrow pathway;
And therefore 'twas held in the highest esteem,
As the very best way to pass over the stream.

But, alas! I beheld, and my heart was appalled,
Though the middle pathway was so highly extolled;
So that no one, at first, from its track would decline,
And every one thought he could keep the right line;
Yet the bridge, as I learnt, was so strangely enchanted,
That travellers by demons so fearfully haunted,
And paid a small toll at the entrance-gate,
Yet many would quickly and heedlessly stray
To the smooth sloping path, and a higher toll pay;
For tollmen in numbers were ranged on each side,
Where the giddy were noticed to slip or slide:
And, though strange it may seem, yet the payment
Increased.

As the hope of escaping destruction was least,
Till they paid altogether, I happened to hear,
In hard sterling cash, FIFTY MILLIONS A YEAR!

While I stood by this river, both bridges in view,
This bridge Moderation and Textual's too,
And marked the crowds passing, I saw with affright,
(For though 'twas a dream, 'twas a terrible sight),
That while by Textual great multitudes crossed
Safely over the river—not one being lost;
From the bridge Moderation—from each shelving side,
That fearfully hung o'er the perilous tide—
Many thousands, while helpless or frantic, were hurled
To the dreadful abyss, and the nethermost world.

Now, shuddering with horror, I thought in my dream,
That, turning away from this terrible stream,
I saw near the chasm, where this dark river runs,
A gray-headed father addressing his sons.
'Look—look, my dear boys,' with emotion he cried,
'At this bridge Moderation, so long and so wide,
With its slippery planks, shelving down on each side,
But mark, I entreat you, that narrow pathway,
So level and smooth, with so little to pay,
'Tis a dangerous road. My dear children, beware,
For death and destruction lurk secretly there.
If once on that bridge a sixpence you spend,
Your joyful beginning may fearfully end.
Now look at Textual—that bridge of renown,
For its fame is reechoed from city to town,
And its friends are now marching with banners unfurled,
Proclaiming its praise to the end of the world.
Then join in their ranks, sign the pledge, my dear boys,
And see the delight the textualler enjoys;
For surely your hearts with delight will o'erflow,
If God on your efforts his blessing bestow.
And one fellow-creature be rescued from woe—
At first being rescued from vile degradation,
And afterwards saved with a gospel salvation.
Then trust in Him only, seek His promised aid,
And boldly press onward, by nothing dismayed.'

The father thus spake, and was joyful to find
His sons were determined, and all of one mind,
In shunning insinuation, without hesitation,
As deceitful and dangerous, the bridge Moderation:
But, in shouting 'Textual forever!' they broke
The spell of my dream, and I quickly awoke.
Resolved not to lose such a lesson,—no, never—
I joined in the cry of 'TEXTUAL FOREVER!'

STAND FOR THE RIGHT!

Stand for the right, though falsehood rail,
And proud lies coldly sneer;
A poisoned arrow cannot wound
A conscience pure and clear.
Stand for the right, and with clean hands
Exalt the truth on high;
Thou'lt find warm, sympathizing hearts
Among the passers by.
Men who have seen, and thought, and felt,
Yet could not boldly dare
The battle's brunt, but by thy side
Will every danger share.
Stand for the right, proclaim it loud,
Thou'lt find an answering tone
In honest hearts, and thou'lt no more
Be doomed to stand alone.

THE LIBERATOR.

OUR FEELINGS AND OUR DUTIES.

A deep sadness, amounting to sickness of the heart, is the state natural to a lover of justice and freedom in the city of Boston, on this third of June, the day after the rendition of Anthony Burns, either to a life of the most rigid slavery, or, more probably, to a death of protracted torture under the lash.

If there were anything to be done to avert this calamity, or if any speedy means could be devised to prevent its repetition, active indignation and vigorous work might take the place of this sadness. But there is nothing. By no possible means can we now help the miserable slave; and, the character of the people remaining what it is, I see not how any different result can be expected from the next experiment of the kidnappers, whether it be tried a week, or six months hence. Boston is content to be ruled by the Slave Power. We know not what future degradation may be in store for us; but it really seems as if this trial had been, as it was intended, a *through one*, not only of our principles, but of our sensibilities, our capacity and extent of endurance. At the infamous schools of 'vivisection,' in Paris, students of surgery practise upon living animals, bought or stolen for that purpose, the operations which they hope subsequently to perform upon men. An unfortunate dog or horse, being first confined by nails or cords in an immovable position, is made to suffer the tortures of successive surgical operations, until he dies, the more agonizing and exhausting being economically deferred to the close, that he may last the longer. Thus in the case of Anthony Burns, every form of injustice, deception, violence and contumely have been successively tried upon the defendant, and upon whoever in the city manifested concern for him. The progress of the case, from the falsehood and violence which marked the arrest, to the meanness which pronounced the concluding judgment, furnished constant and cumulative evidence that the subjugation of Boston to the Slave Power, if not already complete, was to be effected at this time and by these means. But it was already complete. The case was allowed to proceed for a whole week, as if to try whether the city, which lacked manliness to snatch the captive at once from the hands of the kidnappers, would at last recall its ancient (supposed) love of freedom, and assert its manhood. No voice came from the public at large, none from the Governor of the insulted Commonwealth, none from the Mayor of the disgraced city. With the present facilities for travelling, half the male population of the State might have come to Boston the very day after the kidnapping was known, or any other of the six days following, taken down the slave-pen, stone by stone, if necessary, and set the man free without spilling a drop of blood. They did not care to take the trouble; they did not see that the enslavement of this poor man was *their own enslavement*, their own infamy. A few lawyers spun their web of legal contrivances to release the prisoner, and obstruct the movements of his captors, while the agents of the Slave Power promptly broke through, as usual, but nothing was done, save the abortive attempt at rescue on Friday night, which failed for want of numbers and concert.

The vengeance to be inflicted on Burns yet remains; but as far as Boston is concerned, the tragedy is ended. The kidnapped man, captured by means of a deliberate lie, barred from access to his friends, until he could be intimidated by the conspirators against him, tried in a court surrounded by armed men, (armed, not to intimidate the Commissioner—he was ready enough to do the dirty work—but to exclude and over-awe the public;) and sentenced, equally against evidence, law and justice, to be carried out of Boston at noon-day, with the co-operation of its mayor, and its whole military and police force, and the supremacy of the slave power over the North is again made manifest.

But, it is said by many people, the termination of this case has aroused a spirit of indignation in the community, that will prevent the repetition of such an outrage. Believe it, those who will. When was a victor ever much disturbed by the disapproval of the conquered party? Success compensates for a thousand such indignations. The kidnapper comes here, seizes a citizen of Boston, pays a commissioner the usual extra fee (\$5) for a decision that the man is his slave, obtains a special proclamation of President Pierce in his favor, gets from Marshal Freeman and Mayor Smith, (at the expense of the United States,) whatever help is needed to carry him off, finds the whole military force of Boston *submitting* to aid him, and is taken triumphantly in a government vessel to Virginia, there to be welcomed with exultation and delight by the chivalry of that State, the only persons whose good opinion he values. What does he care for the indignation of the defeated Yankees he has left behind? Moreover, if such had been his pleasure, he could have sold this kidnapped man in Boston to better advantage than in Virginia. His own price was offered him, and he refused it. The whole course of the case, as well as its result, affords direct encouragement of the strongest kind to other man-stealers to make Boston their hunting-ground, and we shall probably soon have more such cases. And yet some people would have us believe that all this is to be counterbalanced by the barren 'indignation' of a few thousand people, who stood passively by the streets to see Burns carried away. The end is not yet.

Does the sadness, which these events inevitably inpire, amount to, or tend towards, discouragement? Are abolitionists now to judge the cause of the slave hopeless, and consider themselves discharged from further action in the premises?

In my judgment, not for a moment, nor in the least degree. It remains true that 'now is our salvation nearer than when we first believed,' and also that we must 'work out our own salvation' and that of the slave. The times demand more zeal, more energy, more perseverance, and more diligence than ever. The positions which we have heretofore taken, the declarations we have always made, are now corroborated by additional evidence. If we have miscalculated at all, it has been not in relation to the right principles to be held, or the right methods to be pursued in this work, but in holding an opinion too favorable of our countrymen who call themselves republicans and Christians. We have too hastily taken for granted of the people at large, what Garrison did of the clergy at the commencement of his career, namely, that they would do their duty when it was clearly pointed out to them.

If any means exist for the abolition of slavery more speedily than a re-education of this whole people in the principles of justice and freedom, I confess my ignorance of them. We have assumed, that such principles were implanted in the nation by its pilgrim settlers and its revolutionary sires. In spite of the counterbalancing evidence furnished by the persecuting spirit of the former, and the concessions to slavery made by the latter, we have hoped against hope that the profession of democracy and Christianity in their descendants was a truth, and not a lie. We were deceived, and may take to ourselves such consolation as arises from having erred on the side of charity. But our business now is, not to fold our hands in discouragement, but to gather wisdom from our enlarged experience, and gird ourselves to the execution of the longer and harder task that now opens before us. Next week I hope to speak of two of the particulars in which our action needs to be made wider and deeper hereafter.—C. K. W.

JOHN MITCHELL.

Where the wild waves o'er 'er'd' Bermuda roll,
Lay chain'd a 'fellow' form with Mitchell's soul:
Escaped to 'er'd' America, we find
John Mitchell's carcass with the felon's mind.—W. J. L.

ROBINSONIANISM—THE OLD LINE DEMOCRACY, AND FREE SOIL CONVENTIONS.

INDIANAPOLIS, May 27, 1854.

MY DEAR GARRISON: A few items of the occurrences of the past week in the capital of this State may not be uninteresting to your readers, especially as the week has been an unusually exciting one. In these latter days of villany, and accustomed official baseness and rascality, the history of a case just argued before the U. S. District Court will not startle the minds of our readers as it ought to have done in the purer days of the republic. In fact, originating, as it does, upon the soil of Hoosierdom, where the Robinsonian dynasty reigns, and which is so gloriously represented in the U. S. Senate by a petit wisecracker, whose keen perception has discovered the Declaration of Independence to be a 'self-evident lie,' nothing could be more natural. The case is briefly this: 'plain and unvarnished' though it be, it may, to the blind, fanatical eyes of abolitionists, reveal some of the beauties of the law of 1850, and induce them to forbear their extravagant opposition to it.

Through the patriotic efforts of a certain *Marshall*, four citizens of Lagrange and Steuben counties were reported to the present slaveocratic regime for harboring and concealing the escape of and aiding and abetting fugitives from service. From the indictment as presented by the prosecuting attorney to the Grand Inquest, and by them found as a true bill, the names, names, age, sex, and former place of residence of the supposed fugitives, were to the jury unknown. Nor did this masterpiece of indictment allege whether they were whites, mulattoes, or blacks. And upon this gloriously uncertain document, even less descriptive than those *mercantile* of elegant literature occasionally published by woman-drivers in the pursuit of their victims, did the Robinsonians demand the conviction and punishment of four respectable, industrious and innocent fellow-citizens. G. S. Orth and E. H. Brackett, Esqs., of Lafayette, and Hon. G. W. Julian were counsel for the accused, and right gallantly did they defend them from this miserable prosecution. Upon a motion to quash the indictment, an animated debate ensued, Messrs. Brackett and Julian defending the motion with marked ability. One point was maintained with especial eloquence, viz., that the actual presence of the owner upon free soil, in active pursuit of the absconding slave, was necessary in order to constitute him a claimant within the meaning of the act; and that, without this actual presence and active pursuit, no crime could be committed in violation of the provisions of the statute, by harboring or concealing, or aiding and abetting fugitives. The Court Judge (Huntingdon on the bench) quashed the indictment upon other grounds, however, than this main point relied upon by the defence—leaving this question open for future decision.

But the patriotism of the Old Line Democratic Robinsonians was not to be dampened thus, and whilst I am writing, a new Grand Jury has been empanelled—new indictments are being prepared, and a Deputy Marshal has been dispatched to the Southern Empire to search out the lost masters of her slaves; with slaves, color, age and sex unknown. *Oh! tempora!* I japed in search of a father had no such Herculean labor to undergo! for he had a prodigious nose by which to be directed; but the forlorn Deputy, wandering through the wide dominions of the sunny South, a bell in his hands, and unrelieved bloodhounds following despondingly in his track, has no lamp to guide his weary feet—no torch to cheer his faltering footsteps, save the far-distant prospect of a contingent fee. Of the *smelling* qualities of this *master-hunter*, I cannot speak, not having the honor of his acquaintance; but have no doubt, remembering somewhat indistinctly the case of a certain Ellington, and John Freeman, that deserved success will crown his noble efforts in the cause of the slaveocracy, and that ultimately he will scent out the master or masters, mistress or mistresses, who for months have suffered the loss of ten valuable slaves thus quietly, and without a murmur.

The Old Line Democracy have been making quite a display of their principles. Their State Convention was numerous attended, indeed, without 'insinuating,' we might say it was well packed. They have frankly faced the music, and with more boldness, perhaps, than prudence, throwing off their old disguises, have met the issue long since tendered them by abolitionists and temperance fanatics. They have fully endorsed the principles of the Nebraska Bill, (although none of the assembled sages, saveholding Mr. Chairman Bright included, could answer the impertinent query of a delegate, inquiring what these principles were,) and have bravely hoisted the Whiskey Flag, with the motto, 'No search, seizure, confiscation or destruction,' at their mast-head. Much unanimity prevailed, evidently manifesting the presence of a superior senatorial manager from Washington. John L. Robinson, Esq., was also quite a prominent chief among the fraternity, and conducted himself with characteristic courtesy and propriety. A Mr. Thompson of this city having very improperly and singularly questioned the correctness of his statement, that temperance lecturers and clergymen protesting against the Missouri Compromise were 'itinerant vagabonds' and 'unprincipled scoundrels,' the valiant Marshal gallantly drew his cane, and would doubtless have justifiably sacrificed the Doctor as a traitor to the orthodox Old Line Democracy, had not less devoted defenders of the faith impulsively interfered, and thwarted his designs. After the usual amount of confusion always consequent upon the effervescence of Old Line Democratic Patriotism, and the passage of a resolution applauding the course of Senators Douglas, Dallas and Bright, the Convention rested from its labors, and adjourned.

That this Convention did not truly represent their constituency is evident from the loud murmurs of discontent already heard, and which, as its action is fully represented to them, must grow louder and louder. Especially in the Northern parts of the State, the signs of the times plainly indicate a rebellion by the people, at the infamous attempt made by the leaders of the party to force them upon a platform odious to their convictions of right, and abhorrent to their sympathies. They doubtless are a union, open and undisguised, between the Free Soilers, Whigs, and those Democrats who are unwilling to stand upon the run-cask as their platform, having in one hand the slave-driver's whip, and, with the other, holding aloft a banner wet with the blood of the slave and the tears of the rum-seller's victims.

The action of the Free Soil Convention plainly tends to such an union. Its meeting was conducted in harmony and hope. Undismayed, they viewed the passage of the Nebraska outrage as the harbinger of a better day. They resolved to make no nominations for candidates at the ensuing election, but to call upon all persons opposed to the repeal of the Missouri Compromise to co-operate with them, and recommended the calling of another State Convention for the nomination of a ticket in opposition to O. L. Democracy. Messrs. Julian and Craven endorsed the Convention, reviewing the action of the Democratic Convention, and exposing the iniquity of their principles.

If the proposed union be rightly formed, there can be no doubt that the infamous wire-workers who have so long reigned over the Democracy, and corrupted it by their presence, will receive the defeat and quietus their unparalleled diabolism merits.

Yours, truly, M. T. E.

CONSPIRACY AND MURDER AT WASHINGTON.

WASHINGTON, May 22, 1854.

Near the hour of midnight last evening, one of the most diabolical conspiracies against the life of a pure and virtuous friend that was ever concocted, was consummated amidst the feeble bacchanalian exultations of her professed but faithless friends, and under the morning eye of those who had striven hard and long to avert the villainous stab of the faithless assassins. The conspiracy has been concocting for many years, but it was not until the last few months that the precise mode of assassination had been agreed upon. Prior

to the last general election, the parties engaged in this nefarious plot against the beautiful goddess, Liberty, (for the victim is no less a personage,) was agreed that freedom of speech among her friends was most likely to perpetuate her existence, and under a cry of 'peace, peace, when there was no peace,' they agreed to stop the mouths of her truest friends. As the plot went on, however, it was discovered that the beauty of her person and the fascinations of her virtues were gradually gaining for her numerous friends. The first step taken was to set up a specious goddess, whom they called 'Popular Sovereignty,' trying to delude the friends of Liberty into the belief that this was the offspring of their favorite. Freedom of speech was again permitted, to enable these professed patriots to disseminate their vile and insidious slanders upon the true friends of their intended victim, and to establish their own idol on the throne, and in the estimation of the people.

The character of this rival to Liberty can be best described as the daughter of infamy and oppression. So far from being what her name implies, she is intended to exercise a power which is in direct violation of the rights of man—ruling with force and fraud those who do not happen to have the power to extricate themselves from oppression and servile bondage. The object of the conspiracy was to destroy the life of Liberty, so that her influence could not be felt in the vast territories of the United States, and in order that oppression, under the guise of 'Popular Sovereignty,' might rule in the land.

After the conspirators, (the leader of whom was one Stephen Arnold, aided by an old Colonel who was well adapted to consummate the last deed of infamy which was accomplished last night,) had succeeded in raising sufficient accomplices, by their bribes and sophistry, to enable them to perpetrate this diabolical murder, they determined to resort to their former plan of gagging the mouths of the friends of Liberty. In their first attempt, they failed, in consequence of the stern opposition, for thirty-six hours, of their opponents. Through the inadvertency, however, of some of those who were believed to be the friends of Liberty, the conspirators succeeded by a stratagem in deferring the commission of their foul deed until they got more completely organized, under the pretence of giving a longer time to the friends of Liberty to speak in their favor. Although they had given their friends permission to defend her, and, if possible, preserve her by efforts of five minutes each until to-morrow, [Wednesday], fearing this liberty might secure the overthrow of their schemes, they determined to resort to means more unusual and unexpected, by which to stop this slight privilege or right of defence to the prisoner, and thereby to leave not only Liberty herself dumb, but to deprive all her friends of the opportunity of speaking in her behalf. Under these circumstances, whenever any friend endeavored to speak for her, he was met by the cry of 'Question, question,' 'Order, order,' &c., which, being interpreted, signify 'Crucify her,' 'crucify her!'

As this was going on, the fire-bell began to ring, and flashes of light were seen. The conspirators, in consideration of the deed they were about to perpetrate, trembled with fear, that the just vengeance of Heaven was about to arrest their iniquity by a conflagration of the building they were about to deprecate, and which their fathers had dedicated to the very goddess they had met to destroy. The alarm, however, being considered a fire at a distance, and this fact being ascertained, they went on with the mock-trial to which they had pledged themselves. Having overruled the customary course of law and debate, thus shutting up the mouths of her friends, they determined to execute the unoffending prisoner that very night, and, amidst scenes of beastly intoxication and fiendish exultation, Liberty, the fairest goddess that ever blessed earth with her smiles, and filled heaven with gladness, was cruelly betrayed by men who professed to be her disciples, and stabbed by those who had sold themselves to the oppressors, and became the tools of a powerful and treacherous crew of slave-breeders, and those who sell their offspring for gold.

Some of the most sanguine apostles of the lamented victim believe that she will rise again. But this is considered a fanatical idea.

It is proposed to bury the corpse on the plains of Nebraska or Kansas, while it is intended that thousands of unoffending victims and slaves shall follow in the train, with their hands chained and their hearts sad. There is some rumor, however, that they will be met by a large concourse of fanatics—followers of their murdered friend—who will endeavor to raise her again to life. These people believe, that if not present in the flesh, she will be in the spirit, and that she will ultimately enable them to 'open the prison doors to them that are bound,' and to 'let the oppressed go free.'

We may say, that the number of conspirators ostensibly engaged, and who signified their assent, was 113; whilst the number of friends to Liberty was 100. It is well known, however, that besides the 113, there were individuals holding office and patronage in their hands, who were the principal instigators of this notorious plot, and who were even present on this occasion to overawe by their presence any timid conspirator who might be weak enough to allow conscience for one moment to influence his action, and deter him from committing the deed of infamy.

DECISION OF COMMISSIONER LORING.

The issue between the parties arises under the U. S. statute of 1850, and for the respondent it is argued that the statute is unconstitutional. Whether this objection is made, it becomes necessary to recur to the purpose of the statute. It purports to carry into execution the provision of the constitution, which provides for the extradition of persons held to service or labor in one State, and escaping into another. It is applicable, and applied alike to bond and free—to the apprentice and the slave; and in reference to both, its purpose, provisions and processes are the same.

The arrest of the fugitive is a ministerial, and not a judicial act, and the nature of the act is not altered by the means employed for its accomplishment. When an officer arrests a fugitive from justice or a party accused, the officer must determine the identity, and use his discretion and information for the purpose. When an arrest is made under this statute, the means of determining the identity are prescribed by the statute, but when the means are used, and the act is done, it is still a ministerial act. The statute only substitutes the means it provides for the discretion of an arresting officer, and thus gives to the fugitive from service a much better protection than a fugitive from justice can claim under any law.

If extradition is the only purpose of the statute, and the determination of the identity is the only purpose of these proceedings under it, it seems to me that the objection of unconstitutionality to the statute, because it does not furnish a jury trial, to the fugitive, is answered.

There is no provision in the constitution requiring the identity of the person to be arrested should be determined by a jury. It has never been claimed for apprentices, nor fugitives from justice, and if it does not belong to them, it does not belong to the respondent. And if extradition is a ministerial act, then to substitute in its performance, for the discretion of an arresting officer, the discretion of a commissioner instructed by testimony under oath, seems scarcely to reach to a grant of judicial power, within the meaning of the United States constitution. And it is certain that if the power given to and used by the commissioners of the United States courts under the statute is unconstitutional—then so was the power given to and used by magistrates of counties, cities and towns, by the act of 1793.

These all were commissioners of the United States—the powers they used under the statute were not derived from the laws of their respective States, but from the statute of the United States. They were commissioned by that, and that alone. They were commissioned to reach to a grant of judicial power, within the meaning of the United States constitution. And it is certain that if the power given to and used by the commissioners of the United States courts under the statute is unconstitutional—then so was the power given to and used by magistrates of counties, cities and towns, by the act of 1793.

These all were commissioners of the United States—the powers they used under the statute were not derived from the laws of their respective States, but from the statute of the United States. They were commissioned by that, and that alone. They were commissioned to reach to a grant of judicial power, within the meaning of the United States constitution. And it is certain that if the power given to and used by the commissioners of the United States courts under the statute is unconstitutional—then so was the power given to and used by magistrates of counties, cities and towns, by the act of 1793.

These all were commissioners of the United States—the powers they used under the statute were not derived from the laws of their respective States, but from the statute of the United States. They were commissioned by that, and that alone. They were commissioned to reach to a grant of judicial power, within the meaning of the United States constitution. And it is certain that if the power given to and used by the commissioners of the United States courts under the statute is unconstitutional—then so was the power given to and used by magistrates of counties, cities and towns, by the act of 1793.

These all were commissioners of the United States—the powers they used under the statute were not derived from the laws of their respective States, but from the statute of the United States. They were commissioned by that, and that alone. They were commissioned to reach to a grant of judicial power, within the meaning of the United States constitution. And it is certain that if the power given to and used by the commissioners of the United States courts under the statute is unconstitutional—then so was the power given to and used by magistrates of counties, cities and towns, by the act of 1793.

These all were commissioners of the United States—the powers they used under the statute were not derived from the laws of their respective States, but from the statute of the United States. They were commissioned by that, and that alone. They were commissioned to reach to a grant of judicial power, within the meaning of the United States constitution. And it is certain that if the power given to and used by the commissioners of the United States courts under the statute is unconstitutional—then so was the power given to and used by magistrates of counties, cities and towns, by the act of 1793.

These all were commissioners of the United States—the powers they used under the statute were not derived from the laws of their respective States, but from the statute of the United States. They were commissioned by that, and that alone. They were commissioned to reach to a grant of judicial power, within the meaning of the United States constitution. And it is certain that if the power given to and used by the commissioners of the United States courts under the statute is unconstitutional—then so was the power given to and used by magistrates of counties, cities and towns, by the act of 1793.

These all were commissioners of the United States—the powers they used under the statute were not derived from the laws of their respective States, but from the statute of the United States. They were commissioned by that, and that alone. They were commissioned to reach to a grant of judicial power, within the meaning of the United States constitution. And it is certain that if the power given to and used by the commissioners of the United States courts under the statute is unconstitutional—then so was the power given to and used by magistrates of counties, cities and towns, by the act of 1793.

These all were commissioners of the United States—the powers they used under the statute were not derived from the laws of their respective States, but from the statute of the United States. They were commissioned by that, and that alone. They were commissioned to reach to a grant of judicial power, within the meaning of the United States constitution. And it is certain that if the power given to and used by the commissioners of the United States courts under the statute is unconstitutional—then so was the power given to and used by magistrates of counties, cities and towns, by the act of 1793.

who bring to them the certificates of the highest judicial tribunals of the land.

It is said the statute is unconstitutional, because it gives to the record of the court of Virginia an effect beyond its constitutional effect. The first section of the fourth article of the constitution shows that Col. Suttle said—'I make you a promise, and I make you a promise.' To me this evidence, when applied to the question of identity, confirms and establishes that the testimony of Mr. Brent is in conflict with that of the many of Caleb Page, who was present, and who testified that Burns said he did not come from the State of Virginia. The cross-examination of the promises, and I make you a promise.

To me this evidence, when applied to the question of identity, confirms and establishes that the testimony of Mr. Brent is in conflict with that of the many of Caleb Page, who was present, and who testified that Burns said he did not come from the State of Virginia. The cross-examination of the promises, and I make you a promise.

To me this evidence, when applied to the question of identity, confirms and establishes that the testimony of Mr. Brent is in conflict with that of the many of Caleb Page, who was present, and who testified that Burns said he did not come from the State of Virginia. The cross-examination of the promises, and I make you a promise.

To me this evidence, when applied to the question of identity, confirms and establishes that the testimony of Mr. Brent is in conflict with that of the many of Caleb Page, who was present, and who testified that Burns said he did not come from the State of Virginia. The cross-examination of the promises, and I make you a promise.

To me this evidence, when applied to the question of identity, confirms and establishes that the testimony of Mr. Brent is in conflict with that of the many of Caleb Page, who was present, and who testified that Burns said he did not come from the State of Virginia. The cross-examination of the promises, and I make you a promise.

To me this evidence, when applied to the question of identity, confirms and establishes that the testimony of Mr. Brent is in conflict with that of the many of Caleb Page, who was present, and who testified that Burns said he did not come from the State of Virginia. The cross-examination of the promises, and I make you a promise.

To me this evidence, when applied to the question of identity, confirms and establishes that the testimony of Mr. Brent is in conflict with that of the many of Caleb Page, who was present, and who testified that Burns said he did not come from the State of Virginia. The cross-examination of the promises, and I make you a promise.

To me this evidence, when applied to the question of identity, confirms and establishes that the testimony of Mr. Brent is in conflict with that of the many of Caleb Page, who was present, and who testified that Burns said he did not come from the State of Virginia. The cross-examination of the promises, and I make you a promise.

To me this evidence, when applied to the question of identity, confirms and establishes that the testimony of Mr. Brent is in conflict with that of the many of Caleb Page, who was present, and who testified that Burns said he did not come from the State of Virginia. The cross-examination of the promises, and I make you a promise.

To me this evidence, when applied to the question of identity, confirms and establishes that the testimony of Mr. Brent is in conflict with that of the many of Caleb Page, who was present, and who testified that Burns said he did not come from the State of Virginia. The cross-examination of the promises, and I make you a promise.

To me this evidence, when applied to the question of identity, confirms and establishes that the testimony of Mr. Brent is in conflict with that of the many of Caleb Page, who was present, and who testified that Burns said he did not come from the State of Virginia. The cross-examination of the promises, and I make you a promise.

To me this evidence, when applied to the question of identity, confirms and establishes that the testimony of Mr. Brent is in conflict with that of the many of Caleb Page, who was present, and who testified that Burns said he did not come from the State of Virginia. The cross-examination of the promises, and I make you a promise.

To me this evidence, when applied to the question of identity, confirms and establishes that the testimony of Mr. Brent is in conflict with that of the many of Caleb Page, who was present, and who testified that Burns said he did not come from the State of Virginia. The cross-examination of the promises, and I make you a promise.

To me this evidence, when applied to the question of identity, confirms and establishes that the testimony of Mr. Brent is in conflict with that of the many of Caleb Page, who was present, and who testified that Burns said he did not come from the State of Virginia. The cross-examination of the promises, and I make you a promise.

To me this evidence, when applied to the question of identity, confirms and establishes that the testimony of Mr. Brent is in conflict with that of the many of Caleb Page, who was present, and who testified that Burns said he did not come from the State of Virginia. The cross-examination of the promises, and I make you a promise.

To me this evidence, when applied to the question of identity, confirms and establishes that the testimony of Mr. Brent is in conflict with that of the many of Caleb Page, who was present, and who testified that Burns said he did not come from the State of Virginia. The cross-examination of the promises, and I make you a promise.

To me this evidence, when applied to the question of identity, confirms and establishes that the testimony of Mr. Brent is in conflict with that of the many of Caleb Page, who was present, and who testified that Burns said he did not come from the State of Virginia. The cross-examination of the promises, and I make you a promise.

To me this evidence, when applied to the question of identity, confirms and establishes that the testimony of Mr. Brent is in conflict with that of the many of Caleb Page, who was present, and who testified that Burns said he did not come from the State of Virginia. The cross-examination of the promises, and I make you a promise.

To me this evidence, when applied to the question of identity, confirms and establishes that the testimony of Mr. Brent is in conflict with that of the many of Caleb Page, who was present, and who testified that Burns said he did not come from the State of Virginia. The cross-examination of the promises, and I make you a promise.

This was the testimony of Mr. Brent. The conversation took place was confirmed by the testimony of Caleb Page, who was present, and who testified that Burns said he did not come from the State of Virginia. The cross-examination of the promises, and I make you a promise.